

No. 3031-4Lab-73/9757.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s. Khosla Foundry (P) Limited, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 126 of 1970

Between

SHRI KISHAN LAL AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S KHOSLA FOUNDRY (P) LIMITED,
FARIDABAD

Present.—Shri Kishan Lal workman concerned in person.

Dr. Anand Parkash for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/11416-20, dated 14th April, 1969 of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Khosla Foundry (P) Limited, Faridabad and its workman Shri Kishan Lal was referred for adjudication to this court in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Kishan Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

On receipt of the order of reference usual notices were given to the parties and they put in their respective written statements. In the statement of claim filed on behalf of the workman it was urged that he was a permanent employee since 1962 and his services had been terminated illegally and without any justification, only by way of victimisation on account of his Union activities and he was, therefore, entitled to reinstatement with continuity of previous service and back wages.

The management contraverted the above allegations of the workman and contested his claim on the ground that he had been guilty of mis-conduct but the management had taken a lenient view and had discharged him from service instead of dismissing him and that he had already received payment of his dues amounting to Rs. 319.15 as full and final settlement of his account. It was further stated that as a matter of fact there was no industrial dispute within the meaning of the law nor had it been properly raised by the workman for the purposes of a valid reference.

The following issues were framed from the above pleadings of the parties :—

Whether the present reference is bad in law for the reasons stated in the written statement ?

(2) Whether the termination of services of Shri Kishan Lal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Issue No. 1 has been treated as a preliminary issue and the parties have been heard on this issue. Shri Kishan Lal concerned workman has made his own statement without leading any other evidence, oral or documentary. The management has lead no evidence on this issue.

I have heard arguments on both sides and considered the facts on record. The law is very well settled. To constitute an industrial dispute, the demand by the workman should first be raised direct on the management and rejected by it before it can be taken up for conciliation and a valid reference by the appropriate Government as contemplated under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In view of the specific denial of the management on the point in the instant case, the burden was on the workman to establish by oral or documentary evidence that he had raised the demand within the meaning of the aforesaid rule of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the Sandhu Re-settlement Corporation case but he has simply fail to discharge this burden. On the contrary, from his own statement it has proved that he had not given any demand notice to the management before initiating the conciliation proceedings by means of the demand notice which forms part of the present reference. His statement is further silent on the point that he had made any approach to the management himself or through the Union for his reinstatement before raising the dispute in the above matter. In cross-examination he has admitted the receipt of payment of Rs. 332.90,—vide receipt Ex. M. 1 which is signed by him and the fact that subsequently he had got a job in the Frick India Limited, Faridabad, where he is still working.

In view of the above and according to the showing of the workman himself the demand had not been properly raised by him so as to constitute an industrial dispute within the meaning of the law as laid down by the Hon'ble

Supreme Court in the Sandu Re-settlement Corporation case and that being so there could be no valid reference of the dispute for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Issue No. 1 is accordingly decided against the workman and it is held that no industrial dispute existed between the parties which could validly be referred for adjudication. The award is made accordingly. No order as to costs.

Dated 15th March, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. T/18

Dated 15th March, 1973.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3029-4Lab-73/9759.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Tyre Master, 17-C, Industrial Area, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 88 of 1971

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S TYRE MASTER, 17-C, INDUSTRIAL AREA,
FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri R. N. Roy for the workmen.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

The following dispute between the management of M/s Tyre Master 17-C, Industrial Area, Faridabad and its workmen Sarvshri Hari Chand and others was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal by order No. ID/FD/690-A-71/89331—35, dated 24th September, 1971 of the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

(1) Whether the retrenchment of the following workmen is justified and in order ? If not ; to what relief they are entitled ?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Shri Harish Chand | .. Mixture Operator |
| 2. Shri Dharam Singh | .. Ditto |
| 3. Shri Sant Lal | .. Tubing Operator |
| 4. Shri Som Nath Misra | .. Quality Controller |
| 5. Shri Gissuddin Ansari | .. Curin Man |
| 6. Shri Mangal Prasad | .. Press Operator |
| 7. Shri Jug Singh | .. Inspector |

On receipt of the order of reference usual notices were given to the parties. They were called upon to put in their respective written statements. The statement of claim on behalf of the concerned workmen has

491

been filed. Notices issued to the management from time to time were received back with the report that the factory has since been closed and there was none to accept the notice. The workmen were, therefore, directed to furnish correct address with full particulars of the management which was done. Shri Gian Chand one of the partners concerned refused to accept the notice sent to him under registered cover. The other partner Shri R. Dalmia also avoided service. The management having thus intentionally avoided appearance in the proceedings. The workmen were directed to lead their evidence in support of their claim.

Shri R. N. Roy, President Mercantile Employees' Association Regd., Delhi who represents the workmen has come into the witness box and made a statement on oath that they had been illegally brought under retrenchment without paying any compensation and on the receipt of the complaints Ex. W-1 to W-7 giving the details of the services of the workmen and the other necessary particulars. The management was served with the demand notice Ex. W-8 asking for their reinstatement and payment of their dues but without any response from the management. He has further stated that the workmen concerned have neither been paid their dues nor have they settled their claim with the management before or after the present reference. According to Shri R. N. Roy, the factory was re-started on 18th March, 1971 but again closed after about a month or so. The workmen concerned were, however, not given any opportunity to work even during this period.

From the statement of Shri R. N. Roy, read with the complaints Ex. W-1 to W-7 and the demand notice Ex. W-8, it is clear that all the workmen concerned had put in service for not less than one year when they were brought under retrenchment as a result of the closure of the factory in 1971. The management has not cared to come forward in spite of notice and place on record the relevant material to justify the retrenchment of the workmen. There is nothing on record to indicate that the provisions of law as laid down under section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 had been complied with before effecting the retrenchment of the workmen concerned. One month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment or payment of wages for the period of such notice and the payment of service compensation at the time of retrenchment was necessary. The burden was on the management to establish these facts but as already observed, the management has elected not to appear and bring on record the necessary material. The presumption is that the management has intentionally withheld the relevant evidence just to defeat the claim of the workmen. The fact, however, remains that there has been no compliance with the statutory provisions of law to justify the retrenchment of the workmen concerned.

The question that next arises for consideration is as to what relief the workmen should be entitled to. As pointed out above the factory has since been closed and there is no work going on in the factory. In the circumstances, the question of reinstatement of the present workmen does not arise. They are, however, entitled to payment of their dues by the management including one months notice pay and retrenchment compensation as provided under section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. They are also entitled to Rs 100 as the costs of the present proceedings. The award is made accordingly.

Dated the 14th March, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 225, dated 14th March, 1973.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated, the 14th March, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 3021-4Lab-73/9763.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Escorts Ltd., Plant No. 1, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA ROTHAK

Reference No. 120 of 1970

between

SHRI RAMINDER SINGH KALSI AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ESCORTS LTD., PLANT NO. 1, FARIDABAD

Present :

Nemo for the workman.

Shri K. K. Khullar and K. S. Jain for the management.

AWARD

Shri Raminder Singh Kalsi concerned workman was in the service of M/s Escorts Ltd., Plant No. 1, Faridabad as a Turner at Rs 225 per mensem. The management dismissed him from service with effect from 19th September, 1968. He raised a demand for reinstatement and back wages but without any success. This gave rise to an industrial dispute. On receipt of the failure report from the Conciliation Officer, the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred to the above dispute for adjudication to this court,—vide order No. ID/FD/15045—49, dated 27th May, 1969, with the following term of reference :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Raminder Singh Kalsi was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

Usual notices were given to the parties and they put in their respective written statements. The management contested the claim of the workman mainly on the ground that the impugned order of his dismissal from service had been made after holding a proper domestic inquiry into the charges of misconduct which had been duly established in the inquiry. The workman on the other hand, contended that on account of his trade union activities, the management was displeased with him and he had been given a false and baseless charge-sheet on 3rd September, 1968 and no proper inquiry had been held against him into the allegations of misconduct.

The management has placed on record the original inquiry proceedings and other documents relating thereto. The workman has not put in any objection to the inquiry proceedings in spite of getting suitable adjournments for the purpose. He has not even turned up on several dates of hearing to pursue his claim and even his authorised representative Shri Amar Singh has elected not to appear for him.

The management has examined the Inquiry Officer, Shri K. S. Jain, Personnel Officer, Escorts Ltd., Plant No. 1, Faridabad who has proved the charge-sheet dated 3rd September, 1968 Ex. M.1, letter of his appointment as Inquiry Officer Ex. M.2, explanation of the workman to the charge-sheet Ex. M.3, letter of Inquiry Ex. M.4, the record of the inquiry proceedings (14 pages) Ex. M.5, statement of the workman closing his defence Ex. M.6, inquiry report containing his finding of guilty against the workman Ex. M.7, dismissal order of the workman Ex. M.8 and communication of the order to the workman Ex. M.9.

I have heard the learned representative of the management and given a careful consideration to the facts on records as would be clear from the pursual of the charge-sheet, dated 3rd September, 1968, the allegation against this workman was that on 29th August, 1968 he had misbehaved towards his Supervisor Mr. Dharamvir Gupta, Engineer grade II and addressed him in filthy and abusive language. His explanation to the charge-sheet was considered by the management but not found to be satisfactory and an inquiry into his alleged misconduct was, therefore, ordered and Shri K. S. Jain, Personnel Officer was appointed as an Inquiry Officer. Shri Jain held the inquiry after due notice to the workman who participated in the inquiry along with his representative Shri Om Parkash a co-worker. The management examined 3 witnesses including the complainant Shri Dharamvir Gupta who were fully cross-examined by the workman. The management also produced some documents. The workman made his own statement without leading any other evidence in his defence for which opportunity was given to him. On consideration of the evidence produced before him, oral as well as documentary, the Inquiry Officer found the workman guilty of the aforesaid charge of misconduct levelled against him by the management. The inquiry report was considered by the management and since the charge of misconduct which was of a serious nature had been duly established in the inquiry, the management dismissed him from service and the order passed on 19th September, 1968 was duly communicated to him. There is nothing on the record to indicate that the Inquiry Officer Shri K. S. Jain was in any way prejudiced against this workman not that he violated any principle of natural justice in holding the inquiry entrusted to him. He had conducted the inquiry after due notice to the workman who had fully participated in it assisted by his co-worker Shri Om Parkash. The witnesses of the management were examined in his presence and he had fully cross-examined them. His statement was also recorded by the Inquiry Officer and he had further been given opportunity to produce his defence but he elected not to examine any witness in defence.

The charge of misconduct levelled against the present workman being thus of a serious nature and the same having been duly established against him in a just and proper inquiry, the management was fully justified in dismissing him from service. I do not find anything wrong with the domestic inquiry and the order of dismissal from service passed against this workman as a result of the findings of the Inquiry Officer.

In view of the above, the workman is not entitled to any relief by way of reinstatement or back wages. The award is accordingly made. There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated 14th March, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. T/13, dated 14th March, 1973.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3028-4-Lab-73/9774.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act. No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Armeet Tools and Equipment, 12/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD
Reference No. 92 of 1972

between
THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ARMEET TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT,
12/5, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present.—Shri Chaman Lal Oberoi, for the workmen.
Shri R.C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/72/41518, dated the 1st December, 1972 of the Governor of Haryana, the following disputes between the management of M/s Amreet Tools and Equipment, 12/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workmen was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

- (1) Whether the management should supply uniforms to their workmen ? If so, with what details ?
- (2) Whether the management should fix the grades and scales of pay of the workmen ? If so, with what details ?

Usual notices were given to the parties who have arrived at an amicable settlement as per the terms and conditions given in the memorandum of settlement, dated 27th of July, 1972 Ex. M-1 which is signed by all the workmen. The award is, therefore, made as per the terms and conditions of the said settlement which shall form part of the award.

Dated 9th March, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 215, dated 12th March, 1973.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated 9th March, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

FORM 'H'

(See Rule No. 58 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1947)

Name of the parties .. M/s Armeet Tools and Equipment Private Ltd., and their workmen

Representing employer .. Shri Gurmeet Singh, Director

Representing workmen .. Workmen in persons.

Short recital

The Faridabad Engineering Workers Union, Regd., Faridabad, calling themselves as representative of the workmen, served a demand notice, dated 21st June, 1972. The conciliation proceedings were also started but the management objected to this on the basis of the fact that the Union do not represent the workmen. The workmen themselves also expressed their ignorance about the demand notice and stated to the management that they never authorised any person to serve a demand notice on their behalf. However, the workmen and the management discussed the matter of their mutual interest and have arrived at the following settlement which is witnessed herein below :—

Terms of the Settlement

1. It is agreed by the workmen that they authorised none of the Union office bearers to serve any demand notice on their behalf further agree that in case any demand notice has been served on their behalf the same stands withdrawn and settled by virtue of the agreement.

2. *Issue of D.A., Gradd and Scales and annual increment and designatinn.*—Both the parties agreed that the establishment went into production in the beginning of 1971 and has hardly completed one financial year of its existence. It is also agreed that it is an engineering industry and the workmen are being paid by the management wages as per rates fixed by the Haryana Government. However, the management, with a view to meet the hardships of the workmen agreed to introduce the following grades and scales of pay —

- (i) Unskilled .. Rs 104—4—140—5.50—162.50
- (ii) Semiskilled 'A' .. Rs 130—4.50—185—5—210 (Grade IV)
- (iii) Semiskilled 'B' .. Rs 143—5—193—6—223 (Grade III)
- (iv) Skilled 'A' .. Rs 160—6—220—8—260 (Grade II)
- (v) Skilled 'B' .. Rs 175—7—245—9—290 (Grade I)
- (vi) Higher skilled (i.e., supervisors and experience skilled persons) Rs 225—10—325—12—385
- (vii) Learners Rs 104 for first 6 months and after that Rs 117 up to one year.

(b) The workmen will be fixed in the above grades and scales of pay according to their jobs, qualifications and experience and also according to their pay paid to them by the management at present. The difference of pay will be paid to the workmen, if there will be any, as and when the workmen is fixed in the regular grade and scale to bring him in the regular scale at a particular step.

(c) The workmen who have completed either one year of service and have been confirmed in the services of the management will be placed in the regular scale of pay and will also be entitled to get increment after completion one year of continuous service.

(d) The annual increment of a workmen can be stopped by the management at the discretion in case it is found that alround performance of the workmen in the previous year has been unsatisfactory or has been guilty of any misconduct at any time in future.

(e) The management at their discretion can promote any workman from grade to another grade and workmen will be placed on probation for a period of 4 months. In case his work is not found satisfactory he will be reverted back to his original grade.

(f) The management will issue letters of appointment to each workman individually containing terms and conditions and also showing the designation grades scales of pay wherever it is found necessary.

3. Issues of holidays, casual leave, sick leave, earned leave and festival holidays etc.

(a) The workmen will be allowed in all 10 holidays with pay including 3 national holidays, i.e., 26th January, 15th August and 2nd October. The 7 other holidays will be fixed every year with the consent of the workmen and Government will be informed accordingly.

(b) The workmen are being allowed earned leave as per provisions of the Factories Act.

(c) The management will be allowed 7 days casual leave with pay in one calendar year to those work who have completed one year of service. No workman will be allowed more than 2 casual leave in 3 months span of service period.

4. The issue of gratuity, uniforms and soap and house rent.

(a) *Gratuity.*—The gratuity scheme is under consideration before the Parliament of India and as soon as the same is passed and enacted by the Government, management will follow the same.

(b) The workmen do not ask for any uniform, soap and house rent allowance in consideration of the above facilities and settlement of issues.

5. It is agreed by the parties that this settlement will remain enforce at least for a period of 3 years and the workmen will not raise any financial demand upon the management during this period. However, the management agree to enforce any increase in wages after making necessary adjustment of the wages paid to the workmen in case same is made applicable by the Government under any law.

6. The workmen further agreed to maintain industrial peace and good relations and have also agreed that if there will be any difficulty of any kind or if any workman is aggrieved by any order of the management he will first represent to the management and in case any satisfactory solution is not arrived at them the matter will be referred to conciliation machinery set up by the Government.

It is agreed that the copies of the settlement will be forwarded by the management to the following authorities for registration and record.

- (i) Conciliation Officer, Faridabad.
- (ii) Labour Commissioner, Haryana, Chandigarh.
- (iii) Secretary, Government of Haryana, Department of Labour, Chandigarh.

Signed on this 27th day of July, 1972, in the factory premises.

For Armeet Tools & Equipment Private Limited.
(Sd.) . . . ,
Director,

For Workmen --

For Amreet Tools and Equipment (P) Limited.
For Management.

1. Sd/- Anand Lal Singhania
2. Sd/-
3. Sd/- Dhirender Nath.
4. Sd/- Ajit Kr. Biswas.
5. Sd/- B. Kamarlal.
6. Sd/-
7. Sd/- Tajinder Singh.
8. Sd/-
9. Sd/- Mohan Singh Kalsi.
10. Sd/- Mata Singh Chohan.
11. Sd/- Bijay Km. Pandey.
12. Sd/- Ram Lal.
13. Sd/-
14. Sd/- Ram Kaala.
15. Sd/- Man Bahadur.
16. Sd/- Prem Bahadur.
17. Sd/- Bindeshwar Jha
18. Sd/-
19. Sd/-
20. Sd/- Hish Nath Mourya.
21. Sd/- Surender Kumar Singh.
22. Sd/-
23. Sd/- Sarup Pd. Tewari.
24. Sd/- Jai Parkash.

No. 3032-4Lab-73/9776.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s. Indian Rubber Works, 15/2 Mile Stone, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK
Refrence No. 203 of 1971

between

SHRI NARINDER NATH AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S INDIAN RUBBER
WORKS, 15/2 MILE STONE, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD.

Present.—

Shri B. M. Gupta, for the workman.

Nemo, for the management.

AWARD

The following dispute between the management of M/s Indian Rubber Works, 15/2, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Narinder Nath was referred for adjudication to this court by order No. ID/FD/720-A-71/31643—47, dated 26th October, 1971 of the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Narinder Nath was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

On receipt of the order of reference usual notice were given to the parties. The management has chosen not to appear in spite of service. The workman has also not turned up to pursue his claim. His authorised representative has not filed any statement of claim on behalf of the workman and has made a statement that in spite of his best efforts he has not been able to contact the workman nor has the workman come forward to make his statement in support of his claim in spite of the facts that several adjournments have been given for the purpose. According to him the workman has no interest in the proceedings and the presumption is that there is now no dispute left between the parties. A no dispute award is,

therefore, made as requested by the learned representative of the workman. There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated 15th March, 1973.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. T/19 dated 15th March, 1973

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

The 28th March, 1973.

No. 3237-4Lab-73/9849.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 17 of the industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Telefunken India Limited, Ballabgarh.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 218 of 1972

Between

SHRI BACHOO SINGH AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S TELEFUNKEN INDIA LIMITED
BALLABGARH

Present.—Shri Bachoo Singh concerned workman in person.
Shri A.S. Sethi for the management.

AWARD

The following dispute between the management of M/s Telefunken India Limited, Ballabgarh and its workman Shri Bachoo Singh was referred for adjudication to this court vide order No. FD/72/32473-77, dated 23rd August, 1972 of the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Bachoo Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?”

Usual notices were given to the parties. They have arrived at an amicable settlement. Their statements have been recorded. Shri Bachoo Singh concerned workman has received payment of Rs. 564.45 from the management in full and final settlement of his entire claims giving up his right of reinstatement or re-employment. There is now no dispute left between the parties and a no dispute award is made as desired by them. No order as to costs.

Dated 16th March, 1972

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 850 dated 20th March, 1973

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Rohtak.